

### Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed November 24, 2006.

#### I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed November 24, 2006, Claims 1-20 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 4, 5 and 13-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sarkar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,754,659, hereinafter Sarkar).

#### II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Response amends Claims 1, 2 and 6; cancels Claims 7-20; and adds new Claims 21-30, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-6 and 21-30. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

#### III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In the Office Action mailed November 24, 2006, Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, and 13-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5 and 19 were rejected as being a disembodied arrangement so as to be called a "computer program" or compilation of facts, information or data per se, without creating any functional interrelationship (Office Action, p. 2). Claims 13-18 were rejected as being directed to a "logic" without recitation of a computer or computer-readable medium embodying the operations in the claims (Office Action, pp. 2-3).

The present Response hereby amends Claims 1, 2 and 6 so as to more clearly define the embodiments therein. Applicant respectfully submits that, as amended, Claims 1-6 comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101 and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

The present Response also cancels Claims 7-20, rendering any rejection moot as to these claims. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

#### IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action mailed November 24, 2006, Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sarkar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,754,659, hereinafter Sarkar).

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. *A system for designing a business process, comprising:  
an introspection module that generates a catalog of generic components by introspecting a set of exposed application programming interfaces (APIs) of a plurality of heterogeneous applications created in different programming languages and transforming a plurality of implementation-specific components of said heterogeneous applications into the generic components of said catalog, the implementation-specific components associated with a plurality of implementations;  
a component manager coupled to the introspection module and operable to manage said catalog generated by the introspection module by defining and organizing the generic components in said catalog; and  
a process designer coupled to the component manager and operable to:  
select at least one of the generic components from said catalog managed by the component manager; and  
generate a business process that includes a series of activities and transitions wherein at least one activity of said business process invokes the selected generic component from said catalog; and  
one or more process engines that execute said business process.*

As amended, Claim 1 defines an introspection module that generates a catalog of generic components by introspecting a set of exposed application programming interfaces of a plurality of heterogeneous applications. The introspection module creates this generic catalog by transforming the implementation-specific components of the heterogeneous applications into a set of generic components in the catalog. The process designer can then be used to design and generate various business processes that include activities and transitions. For example, at least one generic component is selected from the generic components from the catalog and a business process can be generated that includes an activity that invokes the selected generic component in the catalog. The one or more process engines can subsequently execute the business process generated by the process designer. Furthermore, Claim 1 defines a component manager that manages the catalog by defining and organizing the generic components of the catalog.

The advantages of the features in Claim 1 include for example the ability to automate the design of business processes by integrating a variety of heterogeneous applications created in multiple programming languages into a generic catalog and allowing each newly created business process to invoke the generic components of the catalog. The process designer can thus allow users to graphically create various new business processes by invoking the application functionality without knowing the details of the APIs of those applications, nor any technology implementation specifics of those applications.

Sarkar teaches a method for running existing Java Beans in an Enterprise Java Bean environment. More particularly, Sarkar appears to disclose defining a single generic EJB and then generating EJB support code for a set of original Java beans in order to drive the generic EJB to perform the functions of the original Java beans in an EJB environment (Sarkar, Abstract). The step of generating support code can apparently include introspecting each of the original Java beans to determine their setter/getter and execution methods (col. 4, lines 28-31). However, Applicant respectfully submits that Sarkar fails to anticipate the features defined in Claim 1 as amended.

Firstly, Sarkar fails to disclose an introspection module that generates a catalog of generic components by introspecting a set of exposed application programming interfaces (APIs) of a plurality of heterogeneous applications created in different programming languages and transforming a plurality of implementation-specific components of said heterogeneous applications into the generic components of said catalog, as defined in Claim 1. For example, Sarkar does not appear to be at all concerned with generating any catalog of generic components, as defined in Claim 1. Similarly, Sarkar does not disclose a plurality of heterogeneous applications created in different programming languages nor introspecting the APIs of those applications in order to generate the catalog. At most, Sarkar appears to teach a way to run original Java bean code in an Enterprise Java Bean (EJB) environment. There is no plurality of applications created in multiple programming languages because all of Sarkar's applications appear to be Java applications. More importantly, Sarkar appears to merely convert functionality of one type of bean into another, rather than generating a generic catalog from many different applications created in multiple programming languages, as defined in Claim 1.

Secondly, Sarkar fails to disclose a process designer operable to select at least one generic component from the catalog managed and generate a business process that includes a series of activities and transitions wherein at least one activity of said business process invokes the selected generic component from said catalog, as defined in Claim 1. As already discussed, there is no disclosure of any catalog in Sarkar. Furthermore, Sarkar does not appear to be at all

concerned with generating any business processes. A business process includes a series of activities and transitions and Claim 1 defines selecting at least one generic component from the catalog and then generating a business process that includes an activity which invokes that selected generic component. Sarkar fails to disclose any such functionality. Instead, Sarkar is merely concerned with Java beans and enabling original Java beans to function in an EJB environment. This is not the same as the features defined in Claim 1.

Thirdly, Sarkar fails to disclose a component manager that is operable to manage the catalog by defining and organizing the generic components in the catalog, as defined in Claim 1. Since Sarkar fails to disclose generating any catalog, it also does not teach any manager that organizes and defines the components in such a catalog, as defined in Claim 1.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 2-6**

Claims 2-6 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-6 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

#### **Claims 7-20**

The present Response cancels Claims 7-20, thereby rendering any rejection moot as to these claims. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

#### **V. Additional Amendment**

The present Response hereby adds new Claims 21-30. Applicant respectfully submits that new Claims 21-30 are allowable over the cited references and consideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **VI. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 21, 2007

By: /Justas Geringson/

Justas Geringson  
Reg. No. 57,033

Customer No.: 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800  
Fax: (415) 362-2928